

**OLDER ADULT PERFORMANCE OUTCOME PILOT  
COMMITTEE MEETING SYNOPSIS  
February 29, 2000**

Jim Higgins, Department of Mental Health (DMH), led introductions and reviewed the agenda (Attachment 1). Representatives from the following counties were present: Astrid Beigel and Laura Trejo (Los Angeles County), Stephanie Oprendeck and Barbara Mitchell (Riverside County), Mary Flett (Santa Clara County), Carmen Stitt and Victor Contreras (Sacramento County), Sharon Lopez (Shasta County), Judith Hutchings (Sonoma County), and Luanna Smith (Tuolumne County). Jim Higgins, Karen Purvis, and Traci Fujita represented the DMH Research and Performance Outcome Development Unit.

The following agenda items were discussed:

- County Reports. Pilot county representatives each provided a brief status report on their county's progress. Riverside and Sonoma counties distributed bulleted handouts describing some of their pilot experiences (Attachment 2). All counties have completed their training and are administering instruments. Now that some counties have begun to collect Time 2 data, questions arose about how to resolve the logistical difficulties of tracking clients over time. A discussion was held regarding ways to successfully schedule clients for the second administration, especially when most counties have limited staff. Most counties reported that clients generally did not mind completing the instruments, but that clinicians were more resistant.
- Preliminary Data Analysis. Karen Purvis presented several tables summarizing preliminary pilot results as of 2/15/00 (see Attachment 3). These results are based only on first administration data for clients 60 and older. Some of the surveys received to date were missing key selection information (administration type) or were for clients under age 60 and so were not included in these results. Other data commonly missing are: county ID number, marital status, education, and certain medical information. Committee members agreed to screen their county's surveys to be sure that, where possible, these data are included.
- Language Translations. Jim reiterated that we would not be translating older adult pilot instruments into other languages. Since the final set has not been selected, it is too expensive to translate instruments which might never be used.
- Clinician-administered instruments. The committee again discussed the need to pilot some clinician-administered instruments in order to obtain better clinician input. Riverside County provided additional examples of possible instruments.
- Time Frame for Administration. The committee also discussed the need to consider other options for data collection, both in terms of types of data as well as time frames for collection.
- The next meeting of the Older Adult Performance Outcome Pilot committee was scheduled for Thursday, April 13, 2000.